



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/666,617	09/17/2003	Farshid Farazmandnia	02SKY103P-CON	9671
25700	7590	09/23/2005	EXAMINER	
FARJAMI & FARJAMI LLP 26522 LA ALAMEDA AVENUE, SUITE 360 MISSION VIEJO, CA 92691			DOAN, PHUOC HUU	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2687	

DATE MAILED: 09/23/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/666,617	Applicant(s) FARAZMANDNIA ET AL.	
	Examiner PHUOC H. DOAN	Art Unit 2687	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 22 July 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 24-35 and 37-41 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 24-35 and 37-41 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 24-35, and 37-41 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims **24-32, 37-41** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Plotnik (US Patent No: 6,873,608)** in view of **Thompson (US Patent No: 6,529,743)**.

As to **claim 24**, Plotnik discloses a computer software product for use by a computer system to transfer data between said computer system “**Fig. 7, item 214**” and a mobile phone “**Fig. 7, item 210**” for communication with a wireless network (col. 4, lines 5-25), said wireless network using a communication protocol (col. 11 through col. 12, lines 57-16), wherein said computer system is connected to a first end of a cable and said mobile phone is connected to a second end of said cable (col. 14, lines 14-28, **external cable connection 213**), said computer software

product comprising: code for formatting said data in accordance with said communication protocol to generate formatted data (col. 14, lines 14-35); and code for transmitting said formatted data over said cable (col. 14, lines 1-35).

However, Plotnik does not specifically disclose wherein said cable includes a mobile phone interface interposed on said cable between said first end and said second end and wherein said mobile phone interface has an interface engine in communication with said computing device connector, a digital translation block in communication with said interface engine, and a mobile phone interface in communication with said mobile phone connector.

Thompson specifically discloses wherein said cable includes a mobile phone interface interposed on said cable between said first end and said second end and wherein said mobile phone interface has an interface engine in communication with said computing device connector (col. 4, lines 40-61), a digital translation block in communication with said interface engine (col. 5 through col. 6, lines 53-10), and a mobile phone interface in communication with said mobile phone connector (Fig. 1, item 20, col. 4, lines 51-61). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide a cable between mobile phone and computing device connector as taught

by Thompson to the system of Plotnik in order to convert the signal is capable of being transceived within a wireless communication network.

As to claim 25, Plotnik further discloses the computer software product of claim 24, wherein said code for formatting converts said data between a format used by a data terminal emulation program and another format used by said communication protocol (col. 11 through col. 12, lines 18-24).

As to claim 26, Plotnik further discloses the computer software product of claim 24 further comprising code for parsing commands, code for controlling a hardware access drive, and code for an external plug-in module (col. 13 through col. 14, lines 60-13).

As to claim 27, the claim is specifies the method necessary to perform a computer system steps as specified in **claim 24** and is therefore rejected for the same reasons.

As to claim 28, the claim is rejected for the same reason as set forth in claim 25.

As to claim 29, the claim is rejected for the same reason as set forth in claim 24.

As to claim 30, the claim is rejected for the same reason as set forth in claim 25.

As to claim 31, the claim is rejected for the same reason as set forth in claim 26.

As to claim 32, Plotnik discloses a system for connecting a mobile phone to a computing device (col. 14, lines 1-13), said system comprising: a computing device connector configured to connect to said **computing device** “col. 8, lines 51-58” (col. 13 through col. 14, lines 60-13); a mobile phone connector configured to connect to said mobile phone (col. 14, lines 1-27); and a mobile phone interface connecting said computing device connector to said mobile phone connector (col. 14, lines 1-5), said mobile phone interface including: an interface engine in communication with said computing device connector (col. 14, lines 10-14); a digital translation block in communication with said interface engine (col. 15, lines 10-67).

However, Plotnik does not disclose wherein said computing device connector and said mobile phone connector are at two ends of a cable, and wherein said mobile phone interface is interposed on said cable between said two ends.

Thompson discloses wherein said computing device connector and said mobile phone connector are at two ends of a cable (col. 4, lines 40-61), and wherein said mobile phone interface is interposed on said cable between said two ends (col. 4, lines 40-67, **wireless adaptor device18**). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide a cable between

mobile phone and computing device connector as taught by Thompson to the system of Plotnik in order to convert the signal is capable of being transceived within a wireless communication network.

As to claim 37, 40, Plotnik further discloses wherein said computing device connector is a Universal Serial Bus connector (col. 14, lines 10-14).

As to claim 38, 41, Plotnik further discloses wherein said computing device is a personal computer (col. 14, lines 1-3).

As to claim 39, Plotnik discloses a cable for connecting a mobile phone to a computing device (col. 14 through col. 14, lines 65-5). However Plotnik does not disclose said cable comprising: a first end configured to connect to said computing device; a second end configured to connect to said mobile phone; and a mobile phone interface interposed on said cable between said first end and said second end, said mobile phone interface including: an interface engine in communication with said computing device connector; a digital translation block in communication with said interface engine; and a mobile phone interface in communication with said mobile phone connector.

Thompson discloses said cable comprising: a first end configured to connect to said computing device (col. 4, lines 40-61); a second end configured to connect to said mobile phone (col. 4, lines 50-60); and a mobile phone interface interposed on said cable between said first end and said second end, said mobile phone interface including: an interface engine in communication with said computing

device connector (col. 4, lines 40-61); a digital translation block in communication with said interface engine (col. 5 through col. 6, lines 53-10); and a mobile phone interface in communication with said mobile phone connector (Fig. 1, item 20, col. 4, lines 51-61). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide a cable between mobile phone and computing device connector as taught by Thompson to the system of Plotnik in order to convert the signal is capable of being transceived within a wireless communication network.

4. Claims **33-35** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Plotnik in view of Thompson as applied to claim 32 above, and **further in view of Colson (US Patent No: 6,574,734)**.

As to claim **33**, the combination of Plotnik and Nakatsugawa do not disclose the system of claim 32 further comprising: a software program for controlling said mobile phone interface.

However, Colson specific discloses the system of claim 32 further comprising: a software program for controlling said mobile phone **"ECU is a mobile phone, col. 6, lines 24-27"** interface (col. 7 through col. 8, lines 59-40). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide software program to controlling the mobile phone interface as taught by Colson the the

system of Plotnik and Nakatsugawa in order to support software driver in term of communication devices.

As to claim 34, the combination of Plotnik and Nakatsugawa disclose the system of claim 33, wherein said software program runs on said computing device (col. 6 through col. 7, lines 55-48, and col. 15, lines 20-31 of Colson).

As to claim 35, the combination of Plotnik and Nakatsugawa disclose the system of claim 33, wherein said software program converts data between a format used by said personal computer and another format used by said mobile phone (col. 7 through col. 8, lines 59-52, and col. 9, lines 35-49 of Colson).

Conclusion

5. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the

advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to PHUOC H. DOAN whose telephone number is 571-272-7920. The examiner can normally be reached on 9:30 AM - 6:30 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, LESTER G. KINCAID can be reached on 571-272-7922. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Application/Control Number: 10/666,617


Page 10

Art Unit: 2687

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Phuoc Doan", with a long, sweeping horizontal line extending to the right.

Phuoc Doan

09/13/05

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Sonny Trinh", written in a cursive style.

SONNY TRINH
PRIMARY EXAMINER